

REMARKS

Interview Summary

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the issues raised in the December 4 Office Action during the interview on February 5. During the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' attorney discussed the proper interpretation of the claim language and claim language to make the claims more clear. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the term "unloaded condition" was unclear and that the term "relaxed condition" would be more readily understandable. Accordingly, the claim language has been amended to change the language "unloaded condition" to "relaxed condition." It is respectfully submitted that these terms are interchangeable and no change in meaning or scope of the claims is intended by the above amendments. Support for the wire body having a substantially straight section in the relaxed condition which is larger than the diameter of the aneurysm or blood vessel may be found at pg. 4, lines 3-10; pg. 10, lines 15-18; and pg. 11, lines 6-15. Applicants believe the application is now in condition for allowance and appreciate the Examiner's due consideration of the amendments above and the following comments.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Claim Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 12-16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,122,136 to Guglielmi et al. The Examiner has also rejected claims 1 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,994,069 to Ritchart et al.

Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments. In order to expedite prosecution of Applicants' claims, claims 1, 3, 8, 10-11 and 19-20 have been amended to change the terminology of an "unloaded condition" to a "relaxed condition." Thus, the claim language is now readily understood to mean that the wire body has a section that is larger than the diameter of the aneurysm or blood vessel and is substantially straight in a relaxed condition. It is respectfully submitted that neither Guglielmi nor Ritchart disclose all of the limitations of Applicants' claims.

With respect to Ritchart, it is respectfully pointed out that the Examiner previously rejected Applicants' claims based on Ritchart and withdrew all such rejections in

response to Applicants' March 21, 2007 RCE. In light of the clarification to the claim language made above, it is believed that Applicants' prior arguments, repeated here, still apply and overcome the prior art disclosed in Ritchart. In particular, it is respectfully submitted that none of the embodiments in Ritchart disclose Applicants' claimed invention. In Figures 2A and 3A, the wire body of Ritchart et al. is shown in a "stretched condition." (Col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 5). In fact, the relaxed condition of these wire bodies is shown in Figures 2C and 3B. As clearly shown in Figures 2C and 3B, the relaxed condition of the wire bodies has an irregular, random shape, not a substantially straight shape. Therefore, neither of these embodiments satisfy Applicants' claim limitations that the wire body has a section that is "substantially straight in a relaxed condition" and a length of the section is "larger than a diameter" of either a blood vessel area or an aneurysm.

Similarly, Guglielmi does not disclose a wire body that is substantially straight in the relaxed condition. As shown in Figure 1, the wire body forms a helix in the relaxed condition. Figure 2 shows a short wire body that is straight, but as described in the specification, this wire body does not include a bonding location (e.g., 22, 52 of Figures 1 and 3) for separating the wire body from the guidewire. (Col. 6, line 66 to col. 7, line 11). Thus, Figure 2 does not disclose a wire body that is released into the aneurysm and is frictionally locked to opposing walls of the aneurysm. Likewise, Figure 3 shows a wire body that forms a complex shape in the relaxed condition. Accordingly, none of the embodiments disclosed in Guglielmi disclose the claimed inventions where the wire body has a section that is substantially straight in a relaxed condition and a length of the section is larger than a diameter of the blood vessel area or aneurysm.

The remaining claims depend from claim 1. Because claim 1 is allowable, claims 2-18 and 21-22 are also allowable since these claims incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Any further arguments that could be made at this time in support of Applicants' dependent claims would be superfluous and are unnecessary. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-18 and 21-22 should also be allowed. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1076 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Conclusion

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 8, 10-11 and 19-20 to clarify that the unloaded condition is the relaxed condition of the wire body. None of the prior art of record discloses the limitations of Applicants' claims. Thus, Applicants' claims are allowable. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner may call Applicants' attorney, Richard E. Stanley, Jr., at 312-321-4279. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard E. Stanley, Jr./
Richard E. Stanley, Jr.
Registration No. 45,662
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200